

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 26, 2007 ("Office Action"), Claims 1-47, 51, 52, and 57-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sobel et al., U.S. Publication No. 20040103310, (hereinafter "Sobel"). Claims 39, 41-49, 51, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Herrmann et al., U.S. Publication No. 20040107360, (hereinafter "Herrmann"). Claims 53-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sobel in view of Lineman et al., U.S. Publication No. 20030065942, (hereinafter "Lineman"). Further, Claims 50 and 53-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Herrmann in view of Lineman. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In response to the Office Action, applicants have amended Claims 1, 9, 10, 14-16, 26, 30-33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 47, 51, 53, and 56. Applicants have canceled Claims 52, 54, 55, and 57-59. Applicants have added Claims 60-63. Accordingly, Claims 1-51, 53, 56, and 60-63 are currently pending in this application. Applicants have carefully considered the issues raised in the Office Action and request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the remarks set forth below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-47, 51, 52, and 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sobel and Herrmann. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1-14, 60, 62 and 63

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method for providing security in a computer system, comprising:
 - selecting a set of properties for use in determining if an item is clean;
 - evaluating an item to determine if it has the specified set of properties;
 - sending an add request to a clean group server; and

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682.8100

if the clean group server determines that the item has the specified set of properties, the clean group server designating the item as a member of a clean group.

With respect to Claim 1, the Office Action recites various portions of Sobel as generally applying to the evaluation, request, and determination features of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Sobel describes a locally installed compliance verification component (Fig. 1, 190) that itself "determines 210 whether the client is in compliance with the security policies." (Para. 20). Applicants respectfully submit that Sobel does not describe a clean group server determining that an item has a specified set of properties before the clean group server designates the item as a member of a clean group. Applicants thus submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection with respect to Claim 1 is merited.

Rejected Claims 2-14, and new Claims 60, 62, and 63 depend from Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claims 2-14, 60, 62, and 63 are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. In particular, the prior art does not disclose taking steps to ensure the security of the item that include at least hiding the domain credentials of the item (Claim 9), hiding cryptographic keys (Claim 10), erasing the domain credentials of the item (Claim 62), or logging out a privileged user (Claim 63). Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 2-14, 60, 62, and 63 are patentable over the cited prior art and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 15-25 and 61

Independent Claim 15, as amended, recites:

15. A system for managing security, comprising:
 - a clean group server;
 - an update component which includes updates for items;
 - a clean runtime component, the clean runtime component being installed on an item and being able to communicate with the update component and the clean group server;

the clean runtime component sending an add request to the clean group server; and

if the clean group server determines that the item has a specified set of properties, the clean group server designating the item as a member of a clean group.

The Office Action does not cite to a specific portion of Sobel as applying to the features of Claim 15. Nonetheless, applicants have carefully reviewed and considered Sobel, and respectfully submits that Sobel does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 15 as set forth above. Notably, as argued above with respect to Claim 1, applicants submit that Sobel does not teach that if a clean group server determines that the item has a specified set of properties, the clean group server designates the item as a member of a clean group. Applicants thus submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection is merited.

Rejected Claims 16-25 and new Claim 60 depend from Claim 15. Applicants submit that Claims 16-25 and 60 are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. In particular, with respect to Claim 16, the Office Action cites to various portions of Fig. 1 of Sobel as disclosing a domain controller which communicates with the clean group server. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. The cited portions of Sobel disclose a DHCP server, which those skilled in the art would recognize functions to supply network addresses to client computers. Applicants submit that this does not disclose or suggest a domain controller, which those skilled in the art would recognize as functioning at least to manage domain user, computer, and group permissions to access networked resources. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 16-25 and 60 are patentable over the cited prior art and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 26-32

Independent Claim 26, as amended, recites:

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTIENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682.8100

26. One or more computer-readable media having computer executable components for providing security in a computer system, the computer executable components comprising:

a runtime object for installation on a computer, wherein the runtime object, when executed, determines if the computer has a specified set of properties, and sends an add request to a clean group server;

instructions for installation on a clean group server for processing the add request, wherein the instructions, when executed, cause the clean group server to designate the computer as a member of a clean group, if the clean group server determines that the add request is valid.

The Office Action recites various portions of Sobel as applying to the features of Claim 26. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. As argued above with respect to Claim 1, applicants submit that Sobel does not describe one or more computer-readable media containing instructions for installation on a clean group server for processing an add request, wherein the instructions, when executed, cause the clean group server to designate the computer as a member of a clean group, if the clean group server determines that the add request is valid. Applicants thus submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection with respect to Claim 26 is merited.

Rejected Claims 27-32 are dependent on Claim 26. Applicants submit that Claims 27-32 are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 27-32 are patentable over the cited prior art and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c).

Claims 33-38

Independent Claim 33, as amended for purposes of clarity, recites:

33. A method for providing security in a computer system, comprising:
selecting a set of properties for use in determining if a computer is clean;
evaluating a computer to determine if it has the specified set of properties;

sending an add request to a clean group server; and
based on whether or not the clean group server determines that the
computer is in compliance, the clean group server disabling or enabling
the computer domain account.

The Office Action recites various portions of Sobel as generally applying to the evaluation, request, and determination features of Claim 33. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Similar to Claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that Sobel does not describe a clean group server determining that an item has a specified set of properties before the clean group server takes action. Further, applicants respectfully submit that Sobel does not disclose or suggest disabling or enabling the computer domain account. Applicants thus submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection with respect to Claim 33 is merited.

Rejected Claims 34-38 are dependent on Claim 33. Applicants submit that Claims 34-38 are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. In particular, applicants respectfully submit that the prior art does not disclose or suggest placing the computer's domain account in a disabled state until the computer is proved to be in compliance (Claim 34), or requiring the clean group server to participate in the domain join operation (Claim 35). Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 34-38 are patentable over the cited prior art and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 39-47, 51, 53, and 56

Independent Claim 39, as amended for purposes of clarity, recites:

39. A method for providing security in a computer system, comprising:
performing compliance checks for items;
placing items which pass the compliance check into a clean group;
and
removing items from the clean group which fail the compliance check;

wherein items within the clean group can access a collection of IPSec communication requirements and parameters that allow them to communicate with other items within the clean group; and

items not within the clean group cannot access the collection of IPSec communication requirements and parameters, and are thereby quarantined from receiving information from or sending information to items within the clean group.

The Office Action recites various portions of Sobel and Herrmann as applying to the features of Claim 39. However, applicants submit that neither Sobel nor Herrmann discloses or suggests items within the clean group can access a collection of IPSec communication requirements and parameters that allow them to communicate with other items within the clean group. Applicants further submit that neither Sobel nor Herrmann discloses or suggests items not within the clean group cannot access the collection of IPSec communication requirements and parameters, and are thereby quarantined from receiving information from or sending information to items within the clean group. Indeed, the Office Action admits that neither Sobel nor Herrmann discloses "computers which are not members of the clean group are effectively prevented from communicating with computers in the clean group, thus in effect providing a quarantine mechanism." Paras. 15, 20. Applicants thus submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection with respect to Claim 39 is merited.

Rejected Claims 40-49, 51, 53, and 56 are dependent on Claim 39. Applicants submit that Claims 40-47 and 51 are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. In particular, as admitted in the Office Action (Paras. 16, 21), neither Sobel nor Herrmann discloses the security policy provides IPSec communication requirements and parameters, as recited in Claim 53. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 40-49, 51, 53, and 56 are patentable over the cited prior art and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 53 and 56

The Office Action asserts that Claims 53 and 56 are unpatentable over Sobel in view of Lineman, and are also unpatentable over Herrmann in view of Lineman. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Rejected Claims 53 and 56 are dependent on Claim 39. Applicants submit that Claims 53 and 56 are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. In particular, with regard to Claim 53, neither Sobel, Lineman, nor Herrmann either discloses or suggests giving access to the collection of IPSec settings by binding active directory group policy to the clean group membership such that only members of the clean group can read the policy. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that Claims 1-51, 53, 56, and 60-63 are in condition for allowance over the cited and applied references, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Melanie J. Seelig
Registration No. 44,328
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1764

MJS:lal:lpz

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100